

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 3. The change to Fig. 3 is discussed in the Remarks section of this paper.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-17 are pending. Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, and 11 have been canceled.

Claims 12-17 are new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

A replacement drawing sheet that includes Figure 3 is attached. The only change made to Fig. 3 is the correction of a typographical error in the word "registration" in step 808 of the flow chart.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirohama *et al.* in view of Mendez *et al.* The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the claimed invention, a sensor identification in the data transmitted from the transmitter and previously set sensor identification are compared. If a match exists, the sensor identification is registered in the receiver. Neither the patent to Hirohama *et al.* nor the patent to Mendez *et al.* discloses or suggests this feature. Therefore, a combination of Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.* cannot include this feature, and this rejection should be withdrawn. The patents to Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.* are discussed in more detail below.

The Hirohama *et al.* patent fails to disclose or suggest the claimed comparison and that registration is performed when a comparison results in a match. In the Hirohama *et al.* patent, an ID registration is performed based on proximity between the transmitter 5 and the registration unit 9. That is, the registration unit only transmits the transmission instruction to the transmitter unit and does not determine whether a sensor identification and a previously set sensor

identification match. Further, in the Hirohama *et al.* patent, there is no registration of a sensor identification in a receiver when such a comparison results in a match.

Unlike the claimed invention, the Hirohama *et al.* method requires that a sensor position be transmitted in a predetermined order. Further, when an ID including a function code is received from the transmitter while the wheel is rotating, the ID is registered. The wireless ID registration device only transmits a function code to the transmitter. The receiver does not communicate with the transmitter. When two blocks or packets are received with the ID in the same order, the ID is registered. In the Hirohama *et al.* method, the tire position and the registration order are predetermined such as FR followed by FL, and IDs transmitted in the predetermined order are assigned to each of the tire positions.

The patent to Mendez *et al.* also fails to disclose or suggest comparing a sensor identification with a previously set sensor identification and registering a sensor if the sensor identification matches the previously set sensor identification. Therefore, even if one combines the method of Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.* the terms of claim 1 are not satisfied by the resulting combination, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 requires, among other things, identifying the transmitters by determining if each of the plurality of sensor identification data matches with each of a plurality of set identification data stored in a receiver memory. Thus, the sensor identification data is compared with identification data stored in the receiver memory and it is determined whether there is a match. Then, identified transmitters are registered. Neither the patent to Hirohama *et al.* nor the patent to Mendez *et al.* discloses or suggests this feature. Therefore, a combination of Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.* cannot include this feature, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 depends on claim 8 and is thus considered to be patentably distinguished from the combination of Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.* for the reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirohama *et al.* in view of Mendez *et al.* and Okubo. Claims 3 and 7 depend on claim 1 and are thus considered to be patentable at least based on their dependency. Further, the patent to Okubo fails to supply what is missing in the combination of Hirohama *et al.* and Mendez *et al.*, since the patent to Okubo fails to disclose or suggest comparing a sensor identification with a previously set sensor identification and registering a sensor if the sensor identification matches the previously set sensor identification.

Further, in the claimed invention, the ID received by the receiver is registered in the receiver, and the ID received by the external device is registered in the receiver. Such a configuration is not taught or suggested in Okubo. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3 and 7 should be withdrawn.

Claim 12 is a new independent claim. Claim 12 recites determining whether sensor identification data received by the external unit from the transmitter and previously entered sensor identification information identify the same transmitter before the transmitter is registered. No such determination is performed by the cited references, alone or in combination. Therefore, claim 12 and its dependents are considered to be patentable over the references of record.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Barlow  
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC  
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101  
Reston, VA 20191  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400